

## REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed September 21, 2007, the Examiner noted that claims 1-14 were pending, and rejected claims 1-14. The Examiner took no action in the September 21, 2007 Office Action regarding dependent claims 15-17 present in the Preliminary Amendment, and that is believed to be in error. Correction is requested. Claims 1, 4-9, 12-14 and 16-17 have been amended, claims 2, 3 and 15 have been canceled, no new claim has been added; and, thus, in view of the foregoing claims 1, 4-14, 16 and 17 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter is believed to have been added. The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed below.

### REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

At item 4 on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the subject matter is directed to non-statutory subject matter (e.g. a program). Claims 12-14 have been amended to recite "computer readable storage medium", thereby, fully satisfying the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be withdrawn.

### REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

At item 7 on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-6, 9-10 and 12-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,571,336 (Smith, Jr.) (hereinafter referred to as "Smith").

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite, inter alia, "creating first enters ... characters selected from characters left after deleting characters of the entered password characters from possible characters to be used for a password, and then enters ... characters selected from all the possible characters to be used for a password, and displaying ... a creation table having more entry fields than the sum of the number of characters used for the password to be processed and the number of characters left after deleting the characters used for the password to be processed from the possible characters to be used for a password."

It is respectfully submitted that Smith does not disclose at least the above-mentioned features of independent claim 1. Rather, Smith relates to secured systems using pattern recognition as a method for protecting access, and more particularly to secured lists of passwords and personal identification numbers and graphical patterns (see Smith, col. 1, lines 18-21). Specifically, a grid is used for tracing a user-defined path through it to identify a set of unique characters positioned on the path (see Smith, col. 1, lines 55-57). A 9x9 grid is formed

once the characters have been identified. The user uses the grid to identify a pattern by selecting in order a set of cells corresponding to the number of characters in the password character set (see Smith, col. 9, lines 32-37). Once the cells have been chosen in numerical order, the characters are then filled based on their numerical relationship assigned earlier. By retracing the grid pattern in numerical order the user can then identify the characters of the password character set (see Smith, col. 9, lines 42-46). Stated another way, earlier assigned characters corresponding to the cells are filled in once the user selects a pattern of cells in a grid that is easy for the user to remember.

In independent claim 1, on the other hand, the user "first enters ... characters selected from characters left after deleting characters of the entered password characters from possible characters to be used for a password, and then enters ... characters selected from all the possible characters to be used for a password". This feature is not taught in Smith because in Smith the characters to be used for a password are filled in a previously selected pattern of cells.

Further, Smith describes that once the characters of the Master Code have been placed in the grid, the remainder of the grid is filled in randomly with other characters to form a Master Grid. Therefore, the pattern formed by the password character is masked (see Smith, col. 9, lines 46-51). In claim 1, on the other hand, "displaying ... a creation table having more entry fields than ... the number of characters used for the password ... and the number of characters left after deleting the characters used for the password". This feature is not taught in Smith because in Smith the password characters are masked with a formed pattern that was previously selected by the user.

Therefore, based upon the above-mentioned discussion, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Smith. Further, claims 4-6, which depend from claim 1, patentably distinguish over Smith for at least the same reasons as their base claim.

Further, independent claims 9 and 12 have been amended to recite "creating first enters ... characters selected from characters left after deleting characters of the entered password characters from possible characters to be used for a password, and then enters ... characters selected from all the possible characters to be used for a password, and ... displaying displays, as the creation table, a creation table having more entry fields than the sum of the number of characters used for the password to be processed and the number of characters left after deleting the characters used for the password to be processed from the possible characters to be used for a password". Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 9 and 12 patentably distinguish over Smith for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Further, claims 10 and 13, which depend from base claims 9 and 12, patentably distinguish over Smith for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 be withdrawn.

### **REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

At item 12 on page 6 of the Office Action, claims 7, 8, 11 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,133,868 (Ruest et al.) (hereinafter referred to as "Ruest").

Claims 7 and 8 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1. Claims 11 and 14 depend from independent claims 9 and 12, respectively. Therefore, claims 7, 8, 11 and 14 patentably distinguish over Smith for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims. Further, nothing was cited or found in Ruest that cures the deficiencies of Smith with respect to independent claims 1, 9 and 12. Thus, claims 7, 8, 11 and 14 patentably distinguish over the combination of references.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

### **MISCELLANEOUS – CLAIMS 15-17 AS PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED**

Regarding the dependent claims 15-17 on which the Office Action took no action, claim 15 has been cancelled and claims 16-17 remain dependent, directly or indirectly, on independent claim 1 as amended, and should be allowable for at least the same reasons as their base claim.

### **SUMMARY**

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. Further, all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.


Serial No. 10/750,844

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: December 20, 2007

By:   
Sheetal S. Patel  
Registration No. 59,326

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501